UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/590,299 | 08/23/2006 | Jose Caballero | OT-5361 | 7182 |

7590 10/04/2010

Lisa A Bongiovi
Otis Elevator Company
10 Farm Springs
Farmington, CT 06032

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| CHAN, KAWING | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2837 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 10/04/2010 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| **Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief** | **Application No.** 10/590,299 | **Applicant(s)** CABALLERO ET AL. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Examiner** Kawing Chan | **Art Unit** 2837 | |

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires *3* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: _____.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☒ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 08/24/10
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Walter Benson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2837

/K. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2837

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Yoneda and Robertson in combination discloses all the recited limitations in the claims.

As we have discussed in the previous Final Office Action, Yoneda discloses the claimed invention except the "at least one sensor". Although Yoneda does not explicitly discloses it is using a sensor to determine "a predetermined parking position of the elevator", Yoneda discloses a method for stopping the elevator in a predetemined location (Paragraph [0031]: button 6a is blinked when the elevator at a predetermined location). Therefore, Yoneda inherently discloses a method of determining "a predetermined parking position", which is essentially the same as the function of the claimed "at least one sensor". Thus, just based on the teachings of Yoneda, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize a sensor to determine "a predetermined parking position" of the elevator.

In addition, Robertson is further cited to discloses at least one sensor (39A-B) in the hoistway at a location corresponding to a predetermined location (Col 7 lines 48-53) so as to detect the presence of the elevator.

Since Yoneda provides a teaching of using a sensor to determine "a predetermined parking position of the elevator car above the lowermost landing", and Robertson provides a teachings of using a sensor in the hoistway at a location corresponding to a predetermined location so as to detect the presence of the elevator car, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Yoneda with the teachings of Robertson so as to achieve the claimed invention (i.e. placing a sensor at a location corresponding to a predetermined parking posiiton of the elevator to detect the presence of the elevator). All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made.

According to KSR, combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results is one of the rationales for arriving at a conclusion of obviousness. Since applicant has submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their respective functions.